

5JSC/Editor/1  
8 January 2007

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR  
**From:** Tom Delsey, RDA Editor  
**Subject:** Analysis of the proposed CONSER standard record vis à vis RDA

The attached analysis was prepared by the RDA Editor to assist the JSC in reviewing and discussing the CONSER standard record in the context of AACR and RDA.

No constituency responses to this document are required.

## **Analysis of the proposed CONSER standard record *vis à vis* RDA**

The following is an analysis of recommendations on cataloguing rules, rule interpretations, and practices set out in appendix M of the Access Level Record for Serials Working Group's final report as they relate to the development of RDA.

Recommendation 1 of the Working Group is not included as it was withdrawn by the chairs of the Working Group after discussion with LC CPSO. Recommendation 6 was subsequently simplified to apply to all publishers.

The Access Level Record for Serials Working Group's final report is available at:  
<http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/alrFinalReport.html>

Draft documentation related to the CONSER standard record is available at:  
<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsso/conser.html>

### **Uniform titles for translations and language editions (Recommendation 2a)**

#### ***AACR2 practice***

In AACR2 uniform titles are used to collocate records for different manifestations of the same work. A uniform title is used either alone (for a work entered under title) or in combination with a name heading (for a work entered under the name of a person or corporate body). Additions to uniform titles are used to differentiate works with identical or similar uniform titles, to differentiate a uniform title for a work from an identical or similar heading for a person or corporate body, or to sub-collocate various versions of the work, and various manifestations and items embodying the work. AACR2 rules on choice of access points specify main entry for a translation (and, by inference, for a language edition) under the main entry heading for the original. If the main entry for the original is under title, the main entry for the translation or language edition would be under that same title. If a uniform title is used as the main entry heading for the original, that same uniform title would be used as the main entry heading for the translation or language edition. Similarly, if the main entry heading for the original is the heading for a person or corporate body, and a uniform title is used in combination with that heading, that same main entry heading and uniform title combination would be used for the translation or language edition. However, the use of uniform titles is optional in AACR2.

#### ***RDA conventions***

In RDA, the collocation of different manifestations of the same work is achieved through the use of a controlled access point representing the work. If the primary access point for the work is the name of a person, family, or corporate body, the controlled access point representing the work is constructed using the preferred access point for that person, family, or corporate body, followed by the preferred title for the work. If the work is one for which the title is the primary access point, the controlled access point representing the work is constructed using the preferred title for the work.

Additions to the controlled access point representing the work are made, as necessary, to differentiate the work from another work for which there is an identical or similar access point, or from an identical or similar access point representing a person, family, corporate body, or place.

Further additions are made to the controlled access point representing a work to identify a specific expression of the work, or a specific manifestation or item embodying the work.

Guidelines and instructions on constructing controlled access points representing works, expressions, manifestations, and items, on choosing the preferred title for a work, on making additions to controlled access points representing works, etc., and on formulating references from variant title and name-title access points for works, etc., will be covered in Part B of RDA (Chapter 13 – Access points representing works, etc.).

Guidelines and instructions on the use of a controlled access point to represent a work embodied in the resource being described will be incorporated into Part A of RDA (Chapter 6 – Related resources). The use of a controlled access point to represent a work (i.e., naming the work) will be identified as one of three methods of reflecting the primary relationship between the resource being described and a work embodied in that resource. The other two methods of reflecting that relationship will be the use of an identifier (e.g., a standard number identifying the work) or a description (i.e., one or more descriptive elements associated with the work). RDA will allow the use of one or more of those methods as a means of reflecting the primary relationship between the resource being described and a work embodied in that resource.

The question of whether the element reflecting that primary relationship (i.e., an identifier, a controlled access point, or a description of the work) will be a required element in RDA is still to be decided. In order to meet the relevant functional objective set out in the *RDA Objectives and Principles* document (i.e., to enable the user to find all resources described in the catalogue that embody a particular work), the primary relationship between the resource being described and a work embodied in that resource would have to be regarded as a required element. Conformance with the IFLA draft *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* would also require that relationship to be treated as a required element, inasmuch as the *Statement* identifies the “uniform title for the work/expression” as an indispensable access point for a bibliographic record. However, the descriptive elements currently designated as required elements in RDA fall short of meeting either the functional objectives as set out in the *RDA Objectives and Principles* document or the set of indispensable access points identified in the IFLA *Statement*, not only with respect to the primary relationship between the resource being described and a work embodied in that resource but with respect to a number of other elements as well. In other words, the descriptive elements identified as required elements in RDA thus far are not intended to produce a fully functional description, but simply one that serves certain minimal functions (primarily the identification of the resource being described). In that context, therefore, it would be reasonable not to designate the primary relationship between the resource being described and a work embodied in that resource as a required element of description in RDA. However, the descriptive element requirements have yet to be reviewed with respect to access points required to meet the various functional objectives associated with finding resources relevant to the user’s search criteria as set out in the *RDA Objectives and Principles* document.

### ***CONSER recommendation***

CONSER has recommended the optional use of a title or name-title added entry, as appropriate, instead of using a uniform title for the work as (or in conjunction with) the main entry heading for a translation or language edition. The CONSER report is not entirely clear on whether the added entry would be constructed using a uniform title formulated according to the rules in AACR2 chapter 25 or using the title proper of the original manifestation of the work transcribed according to the rules in AACR2 chapter 1.

In the RDA context, although the difference between a “main entry” access point and an “added entry” access point would be immaterial in this instance, there would still be a difference, at least technically, between using the preferred title for the work to reference the related resource and using the title proper of the original manifestation of the work. In the former case, the relationship would be reflected in the form of a “name” (i.e., a controlled access point) representing the work realized by the translation or language edition. In the latter case, the relationship would be reflected in the form of a “description” of a related manifestation, using the title proper of the related manifestation in combination with a

controlled access point, if required, to reflect the relationship of the related manifestation to a person, family, or corporate body associated with that resource.

While the title used to represent the related manifestation in the latter case would in most cases be the same as the title used as the basis for the controlled access point representing the related work, the data string used to represent the related manifestation might not include all the elements used in the controlled access point representing the related work. For example, the controlled access point representing the work might include additions differentiating the access point from an identical access point for another work, which would not be included when using the title proper of the original manifestation to represent that manifestation.

More importantly, however, the relationships that will be defined in RDA (based on the FRBR model and the relationship types defined by Tillett) treat translations and language editions as modifications of a work. RDA will therefore provide instructions on reflecting the primary relationship between a translation or language edition and the related work (i.e., the work realized by that translation or language edition) by means of an identifier, a name (i.e., a controlled access point), or a description representing the related work. Following the FRBR model, RDA will also provide instructions on reflecting, if necessary, the relationship between a translation or language edition and a related expression (i.e., the specific language version used as the basis for that translation or language edition) by means of an identifier, a name (i.e., a controlled access point), or a description representing the related expression. But RDA will not provide instructions on reflecting the relationship between a translation or language edition and another manifestation (i.e., a manifestation embodying the original language expression of the work). That is because both the FRBR model and the relationship types defined by Tillett categorize translations and language editions as expressions of a work, and therefore define a relationship involving a translation or language edition as either a primary relationship between an expression and the work realized by the expression or as an expression-to-expression relationship, but not as an expression-to-manifestation relationship. If the intent of the CONSER recommendation is to allow the construction of an added entry using the title proper of the original manifestation rather than a uniform title for the work embodied in that manifestation, introducing instructions in RDA to support the recommendation would effectively require defining a new relationship type(s) to cover the relationship between a resource embodying a translation or language edition and a related manifestation embodying another language version of the same work (i.e., a relationship that would function as an expression-to-manifestation relationship). Defining such a relationship would seriously compromise the alignment of RDA both with the FRBR model and with the relationship types defined by Tillett.

## **Uniform titles to distinguish identical titles (Recommendation 2b)**

### ***AACR2 practice***

AACR2 provides for the optional use of a uniform title in order to differentiate between works with identical or similar titles. In such cases, the uniform title is constructed by making an appropriate addition to the title chosen for use as the uniform title for the work. CONSER practice follows an LCRI that provides guidance on when such uniform titles should be created for serials: when another serial or series has the same title proper; when the heading in a series authority record uses the same title; when the heading in a name authority record uses the same title; or when a serial becomes an integrating resource, or *vice versa*.

### ***RDA conventions***

RDA provides for making additions to the controlled access point representing a work, as necessary, to differentiate the work from other works for which there is an identical or similar access point. As noted above, however, the question of whether the element reflecting the primary relationship between the resource being described and the work embodied in that

resource (i.e., an identifier, a controlled access point, or a description of the work) will be a required element or an optional element in RDA is still to be decided.

### ***CONSER recommendation***

CONSER has recommended that the use of a uniform title to distinguish identical titles be optional except in the following cases: when the title is a monographic series; or when the title consists solely of a word or words indicating the type of resource or periodicity of the resource and there is no corporate/conference main entry on the record. Presumably, in all other cases, no uniform title would be created to distinguish a serial or series from another work with the same title.

In the RDA context, if the element reflecting the primary relationship between the resource being described and the work embodied in that resource is designated as an optional element, the creation of a controlled access point representing the work would be required only in cases where a decision had been made (either by the agency creating the description or by the cataloguer) to reflect that relationship in the description, and to do so by means of a controlled access point. If that were the case, the CONSER recommendation would represent a legitimate “agency” guideline on the optional use of the element.

However, if the element reflecting the primary relationship between the resource being described and the work embodied in that resource is designated as a required element in RDA, and the agency or cataloguer decides to reflect that relationship by means of a controlled access point, the access point would be formulated according to instructions in Part B (Chapter 13 – Access points representing works, etc.), and, presumably, any addition(s) necessary to distinguish the work from another work with the same title would be a required part of the access point. In other words, restricting the creation of a controlled access point representing the work to the more limited set of conditions in the CONSER recommendation would not meet the RDA requirement to reflect in all cases the primary relationship between the resource being described and the work embodied in that resource.

### **Parallel titles (Recommendation 3)**

#### ***AACR2 practice***

AACR2 provides for recording a parallel title (i.e., the title proper in another language) either as part of the title and statement of responsibility area (if the parallel title appears on the chief source of information), or as a note (if it appears outside the chief source of information). AACR2 also provides for making an added entry for “any version of the title . . . that is significantly different from the title proper,” which in most cases would presumably include a parallel title. In AACR2, the parallel title is not a required element for the first level of description, but it is required for both the second and third levels of description.

#### ***RDA conventions***

In RDA, a parallel title is treated as a sub-type of the title element. RDA provides instructions on transcribing a parallel title (i.e., the title proper in another language), but does not differentiate between a parallel title appearing on the preferred source of information and a parallel title appearing outside the preferred source of information. Nor does RDA differentiate between a parallel title to be displayed as an element of the description and a parallel title used as an access point. The data recorded in the parallel title element in RDA can be displayed as part of a description, or it can function simply as an access point, or it can serve both functions. RDA does not specify a record structure for the encoding or presentation of data. RDA will, however, provide appendices that map RDA elements to standard encoding and presentation schemes such as ISBD and MARC 21. In the mapping of RDA elements to ISBD, the RDA parallel title element sub-type will be mapped to the parallel title element in area 1 of ISBD as well as to notes on the title and statement of responsibility in area 7. In the mapping of RDA elements to the MARC 21 bibliographic format, the RDA parallel title element

sub-type will be mapped to field 245 (subfield "b") as well as to field 246 (with a second indicator value of "1").

In the current draft of RDA, the parallel title is not designated as a required element of description. However, a decision is yet to be made on RDA requirements for access points. In order to meet the relevant functional objective set out in the *RDA Objectives and Principles* document (i.e., to enable the user to find a specific resource described in the catalogue that is searched under a title appearing in that resource), the parallel title would have to be regarded as a required element, and it would have to function as an access point. The IFLA draft *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*, however, identifies the parallel title as an optional access point for a bibliographic record.

#### ***CONSER recommendation***

CONSER has recommended that an option be provided to not record parallel titles in the description (i.e., in the title and statement of responsibility area or in the notes area), but rather to provide added entries for parallel titles. Such an option would be consistent with RDA, regardless of whether the parallel title is designated as a required access point or an optional access point in RDA.

### **Other title information – acronyms and initialisms (Recommendation 4)**

#### ***AACR2 practice***

For serials, AACR2 provides for transcribing an acronym or initialism that appears on the chief source of information with the full form of the title as other title information. In AACR2, other title information is not a required element for either the first or second level of description, but it is required for the third level of description.

#### ***RDA conventions***

In RDA, other title information is treated as a sub-type of the title element. The current draft of RDA provides for transcribing other title information if it is considered important either for identification or for access. RDA does not differentiate between other title information to be displayed as an element of the description and other title information used as an access point. The data recorded in the other title information element in RDA can be displayed as part of a description, or it can function simply as an access point, or it can serve both functions. In the mapping of RDA elements to ISBD, the RDA other title information element sub-type will be mapped to the other title information element in area 1 of ISBD. In the mapping of RDA elements to the MARC 21 bibliographic format, the RDA parallel title element sub-type will be mapped to field 245 (subfield "b") as well as to field 246 (with a second indicator value of "3").

In the current draft of RDA, other title information is not designated as a required element of description. However, a decision is yet to be made on RDA requirements for access points. In order to meet the relevant functional objective set out in the *RDA Objectives and Principles* document (i.e., to enable the user to find a specific resource described in the catalogue that is searched under a title appearing in that resource), other title information would have to be regarded as a required element if it could be viewed as a title (as in the case of an acronym or initialism for the full form of the title), and it would have to function as an access point. The IFLA draft *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*, however, does not identify other title information either as an indispensable access point or as an optional access point for a bibliographic record.

#### ***CONSER recommendation***

CONSER has recommended that an option be provided to omit transcribing an acronym or initialism as part of the description (i.e., in the title and statement of responsibility area), but rather to provide added entries for acronyms and initialisms. Such an option would be

consistent with RDA, regardless of whether other title information that could be viewed as a title is designated as a required access point or an optional access point in RDA.

## **Statement of responsibility (Recommendation 5)**

### ***AACR2 practice***

AACR2 provides for transcribing statements of responsibility appearing prominently in the item in the form in which they appear. In AACR2, the first statement of responsibility is a required element for the first level of description if it differs from the main entry, and all statements of responsibility are required for the second and third levels of description.

### ***RDA conventions***

RDA provides for transcribing statements of responsibility that relate to persons, families, or corporate bodies playing a major role in the creation or realization of the intellectual or artistic content of the resource.

In the current draft of RDA, a statement of responsibility identifying a person, family, or corporate body with principal responsibility for the content of the resource is designated as a required element of description, but an option allows for providing a controlled access point in lieu of the required statement of responsibility. However, several of the constituencies have raised questions about the appropriateness of that option.

### ***CONSER recommendation***

CONSER has recommended that an option be provided to omit transcribing statements of responsibility as part of the description (i.e., in the title and statement of responsibility area), if authority records exist or are being established and/or updated. In that case, presumably, an access point(s) would be provided. Such an option would be consistent with the RDA requirements as currently drafted, but, as noted above, several of the constituencies have raised questions about the appropriateness of the option that is in the current draft of RDA.

## **Place of publication (Recommendation 6)**

### ***AACR2 practice***

AACR2 provides for recording the first named place associated with a publisher, plus any subsequently named place that is given prominence by layout or typography, plus the first of any subsequently named places that is in the home country of the cataloguing agency, if neither the first named place nor any of the prominently named places is in the home country. In AACR2, place of publication is not a required element in a first level description, and only the first named place of publication is required in a second level description. In a third level description, all places of publication specified by the rule are required.

### ***RDA conventions***

In RDA, place of publication will be treated as one of three sub-elements of publication: publisher, place of publication, and date of publication. Parallel sets of sub-elements will be defined for distribution, manufacture, and production. In the current draft of RDA, only the publisher transcribed first is designated as a required element (i.e., required if applicable). Place of publication is not a required element.

### ***CONSER recommendation***

CONSER has recommended that an option be provided to omit recording secondary places for commercial serials published by multinational corporations with several publishing locations.

The recommendation is consistent with RDA, since place of publication is not a required element.

## **Numbering area (Recommendation 7)**

### ***AACR2 practice***

AACR2 provides for recording numbering for serials in area 3 if cataloguing from the first and/or last issue or part. When cataloguing from an issue or part other than the first and/or last, information on beginning and/or ending date(s) of publication are given in a note. In AACR2, area 3 is a required area for all three levels of description.

### ***RDA conventions***

The current draft of RDA provides for transcribing numeric and/or alphabetic and/or chronological designations for serials as part of the numbering element. If the description is based on an issue or part other than the first and/or last, beginning and/or ending numbering is given in the form of a note (i.e., as an unstructured string). In the current draft of RDA numbering is designated as a required element for serials.

### ***CONSER recommendation***

CONSER has recommended eliminating the use of area 3 for serials and requiring the use of notes to record numbering and date information in area 7 only. That recommendation is inconsistent with the current RDA instructions, which allow omission of the transcribed form of numbering only when the description is based on an issue or part other than the first and/or last. In order to accommodate the practice recommended by CONSER, RDA instructions on numbering would have to be revised to indicate that numbering may be represented either in a structured form (i.e., as a transcribed element) or in an unstructured form (i.e., as a note), regardless of whether the description is based on the first and/or last issue or not. Presumably, instructions on representing numbering in a structured form would be retained in RDA in order to accommodate descriptions following ISBD(CR) specifications.

CONSER has also recommended giving a note on the issue or part used as the basis for the description in all cases, even when the first and/or last issue is used as the basis for the description. That recommendation would also require a revision to the current RDA instructions, which specify the use of such a note for serials only in cases where the description is not based on the first issue or part.

## **Abbreviated titles (Recommendation 8)**

### ***AACR2 practice***

AACR2 provides no explicit instructions on abbreviated titles.

### ***RDA conventions***

The current draft of RDA provides no explicit instructions on abbreviated titles. However, abbreviated titles would fall within the scope of the RDA title element — “a resource may also have one or more titles associated with it through reference sources, through assignment by a registration agency (e.g., a key title), or by an agency preparing a description of the resource (e.g., a cataloguer’s translation of the title)”. Under the current instructions in RDA, an abbreviated title would be transcribed as a variant title (i.e., “a title associated with a resource that differs from the title(s) recorded as the title proper, parallel title, or other title information”). The data recorded in the variant title element in RDA can be displayed as part of a description, or it can function simply as an access point, or it can serve both functions.



***CONSER recommendation***

CONSER has recommended that RDA include instructions to provide access to abbreviated titles (both abbreviated key titles and other abbreviated titles) when the information is assigned by the agency preparing the description or is readily available. In order to explicitly accommodate the practice recommended by CONSER, RDA would need to be revised either to define abbreviated title as a sub-type of the title element or to include instructions under variant title to explicitly address abbreviated titles.